

Lepton Flavour Eigenstates do not Exist if Neutrinos are Massive: ‘Neutrino Oscillations’ Reconsidered

J.H.Field

*Département de Physique Nucléaire et Corpusculaire, Université de Genève
24, quai Ernest-Ansermet CH-1211 Genève 4.
E-mail: john.field@cern.ch*

Abstract

If neutrinos are massive, ‘lepton flavour eigenstates’ are absent from the amplitudes of all Standard Model processes. Measurements of $\Gamma(\pi \rightarrow e\nu)/\Gamma(\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu)$ and of the MNS matrix are shown to exclude the existence of such states. Incoherent production of neutrinos of different flavour modifies the usual oscillation phase derived assuming production of a lepton flavour eigenstate. The new prediction can be tested in long line-base experiments by comparison of ‘ ν_μ disappearance’ of neutrinos from pion and kaon decay.

PACS 03.65.Bz, 14.60.Pq, 14.60.Lm, 13.20.Cz

Keywords ; Quantum Mechanics, Neutrino Oscillations.

In the Standard Electroweak Model, the coupling of a charged lepton, ℓ_i , of generation i and a massive neutrino, ν_j , of generation j to the W-boson is described by the leptonic charged current:

$$J_\mu(CC)^{lept} = \sum_{i,j} \bar{\psi}_{\ell_i} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) U_{ij} \psi_{\nu_j} \quad (1)$$

where U_{ij} is the Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (MNS) [1] charged lepton flavour/ neutrino mass mixing matrix. Table 1 shows the elements of this matrix as estimated [2] from experimental measurements of atmospheric and solar neutrino oscillations. The non-diagonal nature of this matrix gives evidence for strong violation of generation number (or lepton flavour) by $J_\mu(CC)^{lept}$. Conservation of generation number corresponds to a diagonal MNS matrix with $\nu_1 = \nu_e$, $\nu_2 = \nu_\mu$ and $\nu_3 = \nu_\tau$. This is the conventional massless neutrino scenario. With massive neutrinos and a non-diagonal MNS matrix, ‘ ν_e ’, ‘ ν_μ ’ and ‘ ν_τ ’ do not exist as physical states. That is, they do not appear in the amplitude for any physical process. This is because the neutrino charged lepton couplings to the W are completely specified by $J_\mu(CC)^{lept}$ which contains only the wavefunctions of the neutrino mass eigenstates ν_1 , ν_2 and ν_3 .

Indeed, the introduction of such ‘lepton flavour eigenstates’ as a linear superposition of neutrino mass eigenstates leads to predictions that are excluded by experiment. To show this, the pion decays: $\pi \rightarrow e\nu$ and $\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu$ may be considered. The invariant

amplitude to produce the anti-neutrino mass eigenstate $\bar{\nu}_i$ in association with a charged lepton ℓ^- (e^- or μ^-) is:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\ell i} = \frac{G}{\sqrt{2}} f_\pi m_\pi V_{ud} \bar{\psi}_\ell (1 - \gamma_5) U_{\ell i} \psi_{\bar{\nu}_i} \quad (2)$$

where G is the Fermi constant, f_π and m_π are the pion decay constant and mass respectively, and V_{ud} is an element of the CKM [3] quark flavour/mass mixing matrix. Introducing a ‘lepton flavour eigenstate’: $\psi_{\bar{\nu}_\ell}$ as a coherent superposition of the mass eigenstates $\psi_{\bar{\nu}_i}$:

$$\psi_{\bar{\nu}_\ell} = U_{\ell 1} \psi_{\bar{\nu}_1} + U_{\ell 2} \psi_{\bar{\nu}_2} + U_{\ell 3} \psi_{\bar{\nu}_3} \quad (3)$$

gives, for the invariant amplitude of the decay process $\pi^- \rightarrow \ell^- \bar{\nu}_\ell$:

$$\mathcal{M}_\ell = \mathcal{M}_{\ell 1}^D U_{\ell 1} + \mathcal{M}_{\ell 2}^D U_{\ell 2} + \mathcal{M}_{\ell 3}^D U_{\ell 3} \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{\ell i}^D$ (D is for ‘diagonal’) is given by Eqn(2) with the replacement $U_{\ell i} = 1$. If all neutrino masses are much smaller than the electron mass, it follows that:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\ell 1}^D \simeq \mathcal{M}_{\ell 2}^D \simeq \mathcal{M}_{\ell 3}^D \simeq \mathcal{M}_{\ell 0}^D \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{\ell 0}^D$ is the invariant amplitude calculated on the assumption of massless neutrinos. With two flavour (e - μ) mixing so that:

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_{e1} & U_{e2} \\ U_{\mu 1} & U_{\mu 2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_{12} & \sin \theta_{12} \\ -\sin \theta_{12} & \cos \theta_{12} \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

and $U_{e3} = U_{\mu 3} = 0$, Eqns(2)-(6) lead to the prediction:

$$R_{e/\mu} \equiv \frac{\Gamma(\pi^- \rightarrow e^- \bar{\nu}_e)}{\Gamma(\pi^- \rightarrow \mu^- \bar{\nu}_\mu)} = \left(\frac{m_e}{m_\mu} \right)^2 \left[\frac{m_\pi^2 - m_e^2}{m_\pi^2 - m_\mu^2} \right]^2 \left(\frac{\cos \theta_{12} + \sin \theta_{12}}{\cos \theta_{12} - \sin \theta_{12}} \right)^2 \quad (7)$$

Allowing for radiative corrections [4, 5] the world average experimental value $R_{e/\mu} = (1.230 \pm 0.004) \times 10^{-4}$ [6] leads to a determination of the mixing angle θ_{12} via the relation:

$$\left(\frac{1 + \tan \theta_{12}}{1 - \tan \theta_{12}} \right)^2 = 0.9976 \pm 0.0032 \quad (8)$$

The result is:

$$\tan^2 \theta_{12} = (3.6_{-3.2}^{+16.0}) \times 10^{-7}$$

or

$$\tan^2 \theta_{12} < 3.0 \times 10^{-6} \text{ at } 95\% \text{ CL}$$

These results are evidently incompatible with the two-flavour mixing results obtained from the study of solar neutrino oscillations [2] where $\theta_\odot \simeq \theta_{12}$:

$$0.22 < \tan^2 \theta_\odot < 0.71 \quad (\text{LMA solution})$$

$$0.47 < \tan^2 \theta_\odot < 1.1 \quad (\text{LOW solution})$$

j	1 (ν_1)	2 (ν_2)	3 (ν_3)
i			
1 (e)	0.79 ± 0.12	0.57 ± 0.16	0.1 ± 0.1
2 (μ)	-0.45 ± 0.25	0.49 ± 0.28	0.69 ± 0.18
3 (τ)	0.34 ± 0.29	-0.60 ± 0.23	0.67 ± 0.18

Table 1: Values of the MNS lepton flavour/neutrino mass mixing matrix U_{ij} as derived from solar and atmospheric neutrino oscillation data [2].

Allowing also for the coupling of the state ν_3 to muons, as suggested by data on oscillations of atmospheric neutrinos, but still setting $U_{e3} = 0$ [7] gives, in place of Eqn(8):

$$\left(\frac{\cos \theta_{12} + \sin \theta_{12}}{(\cos \theta_{12} - \sin \theta_{12}) \cos \theta_{23} + \sin \theta_{23}} \right)^2 = 0.9976 \pm 0.0032 \quad (9)$$

Assuming $\sin \theta_{12} = 1/2$, and $\sin \theta_{23} = \cos \theta_{23} = 1/\sqrt{2}$ as suggested in Reference [7] (values consistent with the MNS matrix elements shown in Table 1) gives the value 2 for the LHS of Eqn(9). It is clear, from these considerations, that the hypothesis that a coherent ‘lepton flavour eigenstate’ is produced in pion decay is experimentally excluded, with an enormous statistical significance, by the experimental measurements of $R_{e/\mu}$ and the MNS matrix elements.

The correct prediction of the pion decay widths, that assumes incoherent production of the different neutrino mass eigenstates, is:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\pi^- \rightarrow \ell^- \nu) &= \Gamma(\pi^- \rightarrow \ell^- \nu_1) + \Gamma(\pi^- \rightarrow \ell^- \nu_2) + \Gamma(\pi^- \rightarrow \ell^- \nu_3) \\ &\simeq \mathcal{M}_{\ell_0}^2 (|U_{\ell 1}|^2 + |U_{\ell 2}|^2 + |U_{\ell 3}|^2) = \mathcal{M}_{\ell_0}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the unitarity of the MNS matrix is invoked. The predicted value of $R_{e/\mu}$, given by setting $\theta_{12} = 0$ in Eqn(7), is then independent of the values of the elements of the MNS matrix. Unlike in the case where the coherent production of a ‘lepton flavour eigenstate’ is assumed, no information about the MNS matrix can be obtained from measurements of $R_{e/\mu}$.

Although the incoherent nature of the production of the different neutrino mass eigenstates, as exemplified in Eqn(10) above, was pointed out more than 20 years ago by Shrock [8, 9], and the unphysical nature of coherent states of neutrinos of different mass was also discussed in the literature [10] the production of a coherent ‘lepton flavour eigenstate’ at a fixed time remains the basic assumption, in the literature, for the calculation of the phase of neutrino oscillations [7]. The phase of each mass eigenstate is then assumed to evolve with time according to the Schrödinger Equation in its own rest frame (the so-called ‘plane-wave’ approximation). The assumption that all mass eigenstates are produced at the same time implicitly assumes equal velocities, since there is evidently a unique detection event at some well defined point in space-time. Still, in the derivation of the phase, the neutrino velocities, as defined by the kinematical relation: $v = p/E$ are assumed to be different. Thus contradictory hypotheses are made in space-time and in momentum space. These assumptions lead to the so-called ‘standard formula’ for the

oscillation phase [7]:

$$\phi_{ij}^{stand} = \frac{(m_i^2 - m_j^2)}{2p_\nu} L + O(m^4) \quad (11)$$

where m_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are the neutrino masses, L is the distance between the source pion and the detection event and p_ν is the neutrino momentum in pion decay to a massless neutrino. Units with $\hbar = c = 1$ are used.

It has been shown recently [11] that the factor of two in the denominator of this equation is a consequence of a common production time for all mass eigenstates, that follows from the incorrect assumption that a coherent ‘lepton flavour eigenstate’ is produced. As will be demonstrated below, allowing for the possibility of different production times, due to the incoherent nature of the neutrino production process, doubles the contribution of neutrino propagation to the oscillation phase.

Other kinematical approximations that have been made in the literature, e.g. equal momenta and different energies or equal energies and different momenta, result in changes of only $O(m^4)$ to the phase, as compared to the exact result obtained by imposing both energy and momentum conservation in the neutrino production process. Thus all these results are equivalent at $O(m^2)$.

In several previous papers written by the present author [11, 12, 13] results for the oscillation phase differing significantly from Eqn(11) have been obtained. These calculations were based on the covariant Feynman Path Integral formulation of quantum mechanics. Here a concise re-derivation of the result for e^- production resulting from the interaction of neutrinos from the decay $\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu$ at rest will be given. For simplicity, the effect of the finite pion lifetime as well as that of the smearing of the physical masses of the π and μ is neglected. As shown in Reference [12], the corresponding corrections to the oscillation formula are completely negligible. The basis of the calculation is very simple. Each interfering path amplitude has a common initial state (a pion that comes to rest in a stopping target at laboratory time $t = t_0$) and a common final state (defined by the neutrino detection event). There is one such path amplitude for each neutrino mass eigenstate. As neither the neutrino’s flavour nor its production time is observed, the corresponding amplitudes must be coherently summed. Quantum mechanical coherence is a property of the path amplitudes (because they all have the same initial and final state) not of the neutrino production process. Indeed, the calculation is a direct application of the fundamental Eqn(7) of Feynman’s original Path Integral paper [14].

As in the usual ‘plane-wave’ derivation of Eqn(11) [7], the space-time propagators of the neutrino and the source pion can be simply obtained by solving the time-dependent Schrödinger Equation in the particle rest frame. The path amplitudes for the detection of an e^- produced in the quasi elastic scattering process: $\nu n \rightarrow e^- p$ by a neutrino from the decay at rest: $\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu$ are then:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{e\mu}(i) &= A_0 U_{ei} \exp\{-im_i[\tau_D(\nu) - \tau_i(\nu)]\} U_{\mu i} \exp\{-im_\pi[\tau_i(\pi) - \tau_0(\pi)]\} \\ &= A_0 U_{ei} U_{\mu i} \exp(-i\Delta\phi_i) \quad (i = 1, 2, 3) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where:

$$A_0 \equiv \langle e^- p | T | \nu n \rangle \langle \nu \mu^+ | T | \pi^+ \rangle \quad (13)$$

The ‘reduced’ transition amplitudes $\langle e^- p | T | \nu n \rangle$, $\langle \nu \mu^+ | T | \pi^+ \rangle$ are defined by factorising out the MNS matrix elements, e.g.:

$$\langle \nu_i \mu^+ | T | \pi^+ \rangle = U_{\mu i} \langle \nu \mu^+ | T | \pi^+ \rangle \quad (14)$$

In Eqn(12), $\tau_0(\pi)$, $\tau_i(\nu, \pi)$ and $\tau_D(\nu)$ are the respective proper times of the π or ν at which the pion comes to rest in the stopping target, the neutrino is produced and the neutrino is detected. The overall propagator phase of the amplitude $A_{e\mu}(i)$ is the Lorentz invariant quantity:

$$\Delta\phi_i = m_i[\tau_D(\nu) - \tau_i(\nu)] + m_\pi[\tau_i(\pi) - \tau_0(\pi)] \quad (15)$$

Since the pion is at rest:

$$\tau_i(\pi) - \tau_0(\pi) = t_i - t_0 = t_D - t_0 - \frac{L}{v_i} = t_D - t_0 - L \left[1 + \frac{m_i^2}{2p_\nu} \right] + O(m^4) \quad (16)$$

where v_i is the velocity of ν_i . The exact kinematical relation for the neutrinos:

$$\Delta\tau = \frac{\Delta t}{\gamma} = \frac{mL}{Ev} = \frac{mL}{p} \quad (17)$$

and Eqn(16), substituted in Eqn(15), then give:

$$\Delta\phi_i = \frac{m_i^2}{p_\nu} \left[1 - \frac{m_\pi}{2p_\nu} \right] L + m_\pi(t_D - t_0 - L) + O(m^4) \quad (18)$$

Eqns(12) and (18) then give, for the probability of e^- detection distance L from the source:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{e\mu}(L) &= |A_{e\mu}(1) + A_{e\mu}(2) + A_{e\mu}(3)|^2 \\ &= -4|A_0|^2 \left[U_{e1}^* U_{\mu1}^* U_{e2} U_{\mu2} \sin^2 \frac{\phi_{12}}{2} + U_{e2}^* U_{\mu2}^* U_{e3} U_{\mu3} \sin^2 \frac{\phi_{23}}{2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + U_{e3}^* U_{\mu3}^* U_{e1} U_{\mu1} \sin^2 \frac{\phi_{31}}{2} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where

$$\phi_{ij} = \frac{\Delta m_{ij}^2}{p_\nu} \left[1 - \frac{m_\pi}{2p_\nu} \right] L + O(m^4) \quad (20)$$

and

$$\Delta m_{ij}^2 = m_i^2 - m_j^2 \quad (21)$$

For neutrinos produced in the decay of an arbitrary particle at rest [11, 12], or the decay, in flight, of an arbitrary ultra-relativistic particle [12], Eqn(20) generalises to:

$$\phi_{ij} = \frac{\Delta m_{ij}^2 L}{p_\nu} \frac{R_m^2}{(1 - R_m^2)} + O(m^4) \quad (22)$$

where $R_m = m_X/m_S$ and m_X is the mass of the particle (or system of particles) recoiling against the neutrino produced in the decay of a source particle of mass m_S . The neutrino is assumed to be light so that $m_S \gg m_i$. For β -decay at rest, the oscillation phase is given by [11, 12]:

$$\phi_{ij} = \frac{\Delta m_{ij}^2}{p_\nu} \left[1 - \frac{E_\beta}{2p_\nu} \right] L + O(m^4) \quad (23)$$

where E_β is the total energy release of the β -transition.

The first term in the square brackets in Eqns(20) and (23) is the contribution to the oscillation phase of the neutrino propagator. It is factor of two larger than the similar contribution given by the standard formula (11). The second term in the square brackets in Eqns(20) and (23) is the contribution to the oscillation phase from the propagator of the source particle. It is opposite in sign to the neutrino contribution. It can be seen from Eqn(22), that, for light recoil masses such that $R_m \ll 1$, the oscillation phase tends to vanish, strong cancellation occurring between the neutrino and source particle contributions.

Examination of Eqn(19) shows that the mechanism that governs the value of $P_{e\mu}$ is interference between the path amplitudes for different neutrino flavours. A small value of $P_{e\mu}$ is not an indication of an approximate conservation of lepton flavour, but of strong destructive interference between the different path amplitudes, independently of the values of the MNS matrix elements. This is made clear by consideration of the two flavour mixing scenario where $U_{e3} = 0$ and Eqn(19) simplifies, using Eqn(6), to:

$$P_{e\mu}(L) = |A_0|^2 \sin^2 2\theta_{12} \sin^2 \frac{\phi_{12}}{2} = \frac{1}{2} |A_0|^2 \sin^2 2\theta_{12} (1 - \cos \phi_{12}) \quad (24)$$

The term $-\cos \phi_{12}$ in Eqn(24) originates in the interference of the path amplitudes corresponding to ν_1 and ν_2 . For small values of L , e^- production is suppressed by the almost complete destructive interference of these amplitudes, independently of the value of θ_{12} i.e. of the degree of non-conservation of lepton number. The destructive nature of the interference is due to the minus sign multiplying $\sin \theta_{12}$ in the second row of the matrix on the RHS of Eqn(6). This, in turn, is a consequence of the unitarity of the MNS matrix.

Indeed, nowhere in the description of the ‘ ν_e appearance’ experiment, just presented, do ‘lepton flavour eigenstates’ occur, although such an experiment is typically referred to [7] as ‘ $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ flavour oscillation’. In fact, only the mass eigenstates ν_1 , ν_2 and ν_3 appear in the amplitudes of the physical processes which interfere. It is the interference of these amplitudes to produce the detection event that constitutes the phenomenon of ‘neutrino oscillations’. Indeed, no temporal oscillations of ‘lepton flavour’ actually occur. Still the terms ‘ ν_e ’, ‘ ν_μ ’ and ‘ ν_τ ’ may still have a certain utility as mnemonics, even though they do not represent physical neutrino states for massive neutrinos. For example, it makes sense to refer to solar neutrinos, in a loose way, as a ‘ ν_e beam’ since the different physical components are all created together with an electron. Similarly, atmospheric neutrinos are predominantly ‘ ν_μ ’, i.e., born together with a muon.

The values of the correction factor C that must be applied to a value of Δm_{ij}^2 obtained using the standard formula (11), to obtain the corresponding quantity as derived from the path amplitude formulae of Eqns(20), (22) or (23) are presented in Table 2 for different neutrino sources. The correction factor is:

$$C = \frac{\phi_{ij}^{stand}}{\phi_{ij}} = \frac{(\Delta m_{ij}^2)^{stand}}{\Delta m_{ij}^2} = 1 / \left(\frac{E_S}{p_\nu} - 2 \right) = \frac{1 - R_m^2}{2R_m^2} \quad (25)$$

where $E_S = m_S$ for particle decays and $E_S = E_\beta$ for β -decays.

For muon decays and purely leptonic τ decays, at the mean decay neutrino energy, as in the first row of Table 2, the correction to $(\Delta m_{ij}^2)^{stand}$ is only 16 %. The small recoil masses in the decays: $\pi \rightarrow e\nu$, $K \rightarrow e\nu$ lead to very large values of C (i.e. small values of the oscillation phase). For the electron capture process in the last row of

Process	Kinematical Condition	C
$\mu \rightarrow e\nu\nu$ $\tau \rightarrow e\nu\nu$ $\tau \rightarrow \mu\nu\nu$	$\langle p_\nu \rangle = 7m_\ell/20$	1.16
$\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu$	-	0.372
$\pi \rightarrow e\nu$	-	37300
$K \rightarrow \mu\nu$	-	10.4
$K \rightarrow e\nu$	-	466718
$K \rightarrow \pi\mu\nu$	$m_X = m_\pi + m_\mu (C^{max})$	1.52
$K \rightarrow \pi e\nu$	$m_X = m_\pi + m_e (C^{max})$	5.71
${}^Z N_A \rightarrow {}^{Z-1} N_A + e^+ + \nu$	$p_\nu/p_\nu^{max} = 2/3$ e.g. $E_\nu = 9.3$ MeV for ${}^8 B \rightarrow {}^8 Be^* + e^+ + \nu$	1.0
$e^- + {}^Z N_A \rightarrow {}^{Z-1} N_A + \nu$	e.g. $e^- + {}^7 Be \rightarrow {}^7 Li + \nu$	1.0

Table 2: Values of the correction factor C relating the oscillation phase, as calculated using the standard formula, to that calculated using path amplitudes for various neutrino sources.

Table 2, which is important for solar neutrino production, the correction factor is unity. The same is true in β -decay processes when $p_\nu/p_\nu^{max} = 2/3$, close to the mean value $\langle p_\nu \rangle = (11/16)p_\nu^{max}$ of the spectrum of allowed β -decays. There is then hope that mass differences derived from reactor neutrino experiments [15] using the formula (11) will not be too different from those given by the path amplitude formula (23). Actually, the phase should be evaluated separately for each β -decay process contributing to the reactor flux, and a suitable weighted average performed. This is evidently a complex and difficult undertaking. In contrast the corrections for atmospheric neutrinos (predominantly from $\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu$ decay) and high energy solar neutrinos, essentially uniquely from ${}^8 B$ β -decay (as shown in the last-but-one row of Table 2) can be applied in a straightforward manner.

Direct experimental discrimination between the standard formula for the oscillation phase (11) and the path amplitude formula (22) is possible in long-baseline terrestrial oscillation experiments by comparing ‘ ν_μ disappearance’ as observed in neutrino beams produced by either $\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu$ or $K \rightarrow \mu\nu$ decays. Because of the relatively smaller recoil mass in the second process there is a strong relative suppression of the interference phase. For fixed neutrino momentum and source-detector distance, and considering only ‘ $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau$ oscillations’:

$$\phi_{23}(K) = \frac{C_\pi}{C_K} \phi_{23}(\pi) = 0.0358 \phi_{23}(\pi) \quad (26)$$

The K2K experiment with a 250 km baseline has recently found indications of ‘ ν_μ disappearance’ for neutrinos from the process $\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu$ of average energy 1.3 GeV [16]. Using the standard formula (11) the event best fit to the data gives $\Delta m_{23}^2 = 2.8 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ and $\theta_{23} \simeq \pi/4$ [16]. Inserting $L = 250\text{km}$ in Eqn(11) gives a phase $\phi_{23} = 1.37$ rad. Inserting these values into the two flavour ‘ ν_μ disappearance’ formula [7]:

$$P_{\mu\mu}(L) \simeq 1 - \sin^2 2\theta_{23} \sin^2 \frac{\phi_{23}}{2} \quad (27)$$

gives a suppression factor of 0.6 as compared to the no-oscillation ($\phi_{23} = 0$) case. Formula (11) predicts exactly the same phase and suppression factor for neutrinos of the same average momentum produced in $K \rightarrow \mu\nu$ decays. However, if Eqns(22) and (26) are correct, $\phi_{23}(K) = 49$ mrad and a reduction of only 0.06 % of the ' ν_μ flux' is predicted. This crucial test of the basic quantum mechanics of neutrino oscillations requires the installation of separated low energy charged kaon beams in the JHF-SK complex [17], or in similar long-linebase neutrino facilities.

References

- [1] Z.Maki, M.Nakagawa and S.Sakata, Prog. Theor. Phys. **28** 870 (1962).
- [2] M.C.Gonzalez-Garcia and Y.Mir, *Neutrino Masses and Mixings: Evidence and Implications*, hep-ph/0202058, to be published in Reviews of Modern Physics.
- [3] N.Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10** 531 (1963);
M.Kobayashi and T.Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49** 652 (1973).
- [4] W.Marciano and A.Sirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **36** 1425 (1976).
- [5] T.Goldman and W.Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D15** 709 (1977).
- [6] *Review of Particle Properties*, H.Hagiwara *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D66** 010001 (2002).
- [7] B.Kayser, *Neutrino Physics as Explored by Flavour Change* in Phys. Rev. **D66** 010001 (2002) (Review of Particle Properties), and References therein.
- [8] R.E.Shrock, Phys. Lett. **B96** 159 (1980).
- [9] R.E.Shrock, Phys. Rev. **D24** 1232 (1981); **D24** 1275 (1981).
- [10] C.Giunti, C.W.Kim and U.W.Lee, Phys. Rev. **D45** 2414 (1992).
- [11] J.H.Field, *A Covariant Path Amplitude Description of Flavour Oscillations: The Gribov-Pontecorvo Phase for Neutrino Vacuum Propagation is Right*, hep-ph/0211199.
- [12] J.H.Field, *The Description of Neutrino and Muon Oscillations by Interfering Amplitudes of Classical Space-Time Paths*, hep-ph/0110064.
- [13] J.H.Field, *A Covariant Feynman Path Amplitude Calculation of Neutrino and Muon Oscillations*, hep-ph/0110066.
- [14] R.P.Feynman, Rev. Mod. Phys. **20** 367 (1948).
- [15] K.Eguchi *et al.*, *First Results from kamLAND: Evidence of Reactor Anti-Neutrino Dispppearance*, hep-ex/0212021.
- [16] M.H.Ahn *et al.*, *Indication of Neutrino Oscillations in a 250 km Long-baseline Experiment*, hep-ex/0212007.
- [17] Y.Itow *et al.*, *The JHF to Kamioka Project*, KEK report 2001-4, 2001, hep-ex/0106019.